



Fairfield School of Business

Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure **Birmingham Newman University (BNU)** Taught Degree Programmes

Version:	1.1
Category:	Academic Regulations (externally validated programmes)
Owner(s):	Registry Lead
Approved by:	The Board of Governors TBC
Access:	Public – Anyone can view this document
Scope:	This policy applies to student on courses leading to awards from Birmingham Newman University.

Contents:

1. Academic Misconduct	2
2. Plagiarism Detection.....	2
3. Types of Academic Misconduct	3
4. Penalties for Academic Misconduct.....	4
5. Indicative level of offence.....	6
6. Guidance for Handling Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct.....	7
7. Appeals	7

1. Academic Misconduct

- 1.1. FSB strongly believes in upholding academic integrity. To this extent all students are expected to be honest in the work they submit and credit the appropriate sources they have used.
- 1.2. Academic Misconduct is usually called 'unfair practice' 'plagiarism' or 'cheating'.
- 1.3. The work that students submit must be original and their own. Academic Misconduct is defined as any activity employed by a student which proves to be unfair academically and gives an advantage over others.
- 1.4. Poor academic practice is representative of a failure to follow assessment and marking criteria.
- 1.5. Academic misconduct and poor academic practice are not the same. Poor academic practice is considered a minor breach and academic misconduct is a major breach.
- 1.6. Students are expected to make sure their work is in their own words, as well as any analysis they have done and conclusions they have reached. The student can use other people work as supporting material but they need to give the credit and provide reference to the original work.
- 1.7. If the student needs more support with using other people work, they should consult with a tutor or academic support, who would be able to guide them better to avoid any issues, when it comes to the student submitting their work.
- 1.8. Academic Misconduct is regarded as a very serious offence in higher education. Claims that a student wasn't aware of the offence or its consequences, or didn't understand what constitutes Academic Misconduct, won't be accepted under any circumstances.
- 1.9. An academic misconduct case can be started at any time. Even if the student in question has graduated and is no longer studying.

2. Plagiarism Detection

- 2.1. This FSB is a member of the Turnitin UK Service and uses this service to aid Academic Misconduct detection. All student work is fed through the web Turnitin system, which compares the document against a database of billions of internet pages, previous student papers and journals (amongst others). Turnitin provides an originality report for every document uploaded to it, which shows the extent of similarity with other sources.

- Plagiarism detection isn't limited to the use of Turnitin. Tutors also will look to evidence of the following:
- Plagiarism from published texts (not necessarily available online)
- Similarities with the work of other students which can suggest collusion
- Content that appears to be clearly beyond the known capabilities of a student
- Work that's expressed through a style which does not match the known writing or language abilities of a student.

3. Types of Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct will be taken to include:

- (i) impersonation of another candidate or knowingly allowing another candidate to impersonate them;
- (ii) copying or communicating with another candidate in a formal, timed examination;
- (iii) introducing into an examination room any unauthorised aid or sources of information;
- (iv) fabrication of the results of work which the student claims to have undertaken (for example experiments, interviews, observations or other forms of research and investigations) which they have not carried out or results which they have not obtained;
- (v) undertaking research without ethical approval, not adhering to the parameters given ethical approval, not securing informed consent in the manner set out in the student's ethical approval application;
- (vi) colluding with others to present work which is not their own (including the commissioning of work, for example, through the use of essay mills);
- (vii) plagiarism or otherwise misrepresentation of their participation in and responsibility for any material submitted for assessment.

Plagiarism

- 3.1. Plagiarism is when you submit work that is the work of someone else. Copying information from books, articles or other published sources and not referencing them is a form of plagiarism. Copying from other members when working in a group is also plagiarism, you should all create your own reports and analysis and submit them. Submitting your own previous work in full or part, whether it was from this course or another course or even work done in another institution. This is often sometimes known as 'self-plagiarism' or 'double-counting'. Finally submitting the work of any third party, including students and former students.

Impersonation

- 3.2. Impersonation is when you submit work that has been prepared by somebody else. This could include, but not limited to purchasing essays or assignments written by another student.

Collusion

- 3.3. Collusion normally happens when students are working as part of a group. Collusion is different to collaboration. Some assignment may ask students to collaborate and submit joint work. These would be clearly listed on the requirement in the module's documentation. All students in the group will be implicated in the case of collusion. Only where students can provide clear proof that their work has been stolen or otherwise acquired without their consent may they be exonerated from the accusation of collusion.

Commissioning

- 3.4. Commissioning is defined as the requesting and/or purchase of a piece of work from a third party and the submission of this work (in whole or in part) for assessment as the work of the student. The University views this as an extremely serious offence which will attract a severe penalty.

Essay mill

- 3.5. An essay mill is a business where customers pay for a custom essay writing service. It is an academic offence to submit any essay received this way, whether the content is a piece of original writing or plagiarised from elsewhere.

Exam misconduct

- 3.6. Exam misconduct means breaching exam regulations to get an unfair advantage. Examples include, but aren't limited to:
- Use of unauthorized technology during the exam
 - Use of unauthorized notes / other help material
 - Refusing to handover your paper at the given time
 - Impersonation in exams.

Falsification

- 3.7. Falsification is when you fabricate, falsify or make up data, observations or other information in your work. Then it is presented as truthful information.

4. Penalties for Academic Misconduct

- 4.1. Should When a student is found to have been involved in unfair practice by the academic misconduct panel. Then a suitable penalty is considered. When choosing a penalty, the

panel takes in to consideration the level of deception, if the student has had subject to previous accusations, the level and extent of misconduct and any admission/explanation by the scholar of the misconduct.

Category	Action regarding progression	Action remark	Counted for classification	Record on transcript	Notes (these to be used as a guide only)
N/A	None	No action Taken.	N/A	N/A	No evidence of academic misconduct, student exonerated.
0	None	Student notified of Category 0 penalty, but no action taken against any assessment item or module.	No	No	Unwitting offence. Evidence of academic misconduct, but clear that this was not substantial and was unintended (first offence).
1	None	Assessment capped at pass mark.	No	No	Unwitting offence. Evidence of academic misconduct, but clear that this was not substantial and was unintended (second offence or high level of study).
2	Fail assessment	Assessment capped at pass mark.	No	No	Evidence of very minor infringement.
3	Fail assessment	Module capped at pass mark.	No	No	Evidence of very minor infringement (second offence); evidence of minor to moderate infringement (first offence).
4	Fail module, may retake	Module capped at pass mark.	Yes	Yes	Evidence of minor to moderate infringement (second

					offence); evidence of serious infringement (first offence).
5	Fail module, may retake	Module capped at zero.	Yes	Yes	Evidence of serious infringement (second offence). Can also be used for repeat offenders in lower categories.
6	Fail module	No right to retake module.	N/A	Yes	Evidence of very serious infringement with clear attempt to deceive.
7	Fail course	Dismissal from University.	N/A	N/A	Gross misconduct.

5. Indicative level of offence

Indicative Level of Offence	Example	Indicative penalty category
Minor	Poor referencing.	0-1
	Very minor plagiarism.	
Moderate	Repeated minor misconduct.	2-5
	Substantial portions of directly copied / unreferenced 2-5 text.	
Severe	Stealing a test paper.	6-7
	Purchasing essays.	
	Falsifying research data.	

- 5.1. If a student gets a level 4 or above in the penalty category, then the result will be included in the student's transcript and the requirement will be capped for marking. If the student fails then the penalty is going to be carried over and will apply to whatever module is added to a student's record because of the failed module. Students should remember that instances of very severe Academic Misconduct may additionally lead to disciplinary action.

6. Guidance for Handling Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct

- 6.1. Where Academic Misconduct is suspected, the tutor(s) should complete a replica of the form below, summarizing the character of the offence and providing appropriate evidence (e.g. colour Turnitin Report showing similarity scores). This could be emailed to the exams department (examination@fairfield.ac).
- 6.2. Exams will contact the student by email, attaching the report and a replica of the Academic Misconduct policy, and requiring a written response by a specified date. Students are given ten working days to reply to the accusation. The tutor(s) are going to be asked to comment on the student's response.
- 6.3. The case will be discussed by the academic misconduct panel which will comprise of:
 - One representative from the Registry (Minute Taker)
 - One representative Exams
 - Course manager(s)
 - Module leader
 - An additional member of academics, where required
 - The student(s) under investigation for academic misconduct
- 6.4. The Academic Misconduct Panel will consider all aspects of the case, including the report from the tutor(s), any response from the scholar and any subsequent comments from the tutor(s).
- 6.5. Where Academic Misconduct is suspected, it's important for the tutor(s) to submit a report and evidence to the exams department within a suitable timeframe to enable the Academic Misconduct Panel to receive sufficient evidence to fully consider the case and to advise the next Assessment Board of the Panel's decision.
- 6.6. When students receive a replica of the Academic Misconduct accusation, they're advised that they'll request a meeting with their module tutor(s) to discuss the matter.
- 6.7. The student under investigation may seek impartial advice from the FSB's student union.
- 6.8. The decision of the panel will be subsequently communicated to the student and the awarding body along with applied penalties if any.

7. Appeals

- 7.1. If the students wish to get more information on appeals, then they should check the appeals policy for more information.